REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-8 and rejected same. With this paper, various of the claims are amended, none are canceled, and new claims 9-16 are added, so that claims 1-16 are now pending.

Changes to the claims

Claim 1 is changed to make more clear that in the invention claimed there a correlation sequence is first calculated and then used to perform a plurality of correlations.

Besides adding new claims and besides the changes to claim 1 mentioned above, various of the original claims (including claim 1) are changed by this paper in ways believed related only to matters of form. In particular, "characterized by/in that" is replaced with "comprising/wherein." Applicant respectfully submits that such changes are permissible per MPEP § 2111.03 (the transitional term "comprising" is synonymous with "characterized by"). Also, reference numerals/ labels are removed from the claims, which change does not affect the scope of the claims per MPEP § 608.01(m) (the use of reference characters is considered as having no effect on the scope of the claims). Finally, the claims are amended to remove "step of" language.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At section 1 of the Office action, claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by EP 0701334, with Harri Jokinen as inventor, hereinafter Jokinen.

All of the claims require averaging symbols of a received training sequence to calculate a correlation sequence and then performing a single set of correlations using the calculated correlation sequence. Claim 1 recites *calculating a correlation sequence* based on *averaging symbols* of the received training

sequence, and then performing a plurality of correlations using the calculated correlation sequence. Claim 2 recites *calculating a correlation sequence* using the received training sequence, by *averaging a predetermined number of symbols* from the first end of the received correlation sequence with a predetermined number of corresponding symbols from the additional part at the second end of the received training sequence. This calculation of a correlation sequence is following by performing a (single) plurality of correlations using the calculated correlation sequence.

Jokinen, on the other hand, teaches performing two sets of correlations using two different correlation sequences, and then averaging the results of the two sets of correlations. Thus, two sets of correlations are performed, according to Jokinen.

In contrast, with the invention only one set of correlations need be performed using the correlation sequence calculated by averaging symbols of the received training sequence, and so all the computations required to perform the second set of correlations are eliminated.

The Office asserts that Jokinen discloses the averaging required by all the rejected claims, citing figs. 3 and 5, and page 3, lines 20-39, and page 4, lines 5-27. Applicant respectfully submits that what Jokinen discloses at the referred-to locations is performing two different correlations, yielding CORR1 and CORR2, and averaging the results, to arrive at a correlation result for one particular relative position of the received training sequence and the reference sequence, and then repeating this for other relative positions. At page 4, lines 11-12, Jokinen explains: "... two correlations CORR1 and CORR2 are made so that the reference signal and the received signal are shifted in relation to each other." Then at page 4, lines 17-18, Jokinen explains: "The results of the first CORR1 and the second

CORR2 correlations are combined to obtain the result of the impulse response measurement." This combining would be understood by one skilled in the art as indicating adding together, and so is in essence an averaging (i.e. except for the normalization using a factor of one half). One skilled in the art would understand that the sequence of operations disclosed by Jokinen (calculating CORR1 and then CORR2 and then combining the results) is to be performed for various different relative positions of the received training sequnce compared to the reference sequence, in order to determine at which relative position maximum overlap--i.e. maximum correlation--occurs. Thus, Jokinen discloses performing two sets of correlations and averaging the results. This is as opposed to the sequence of operations recited in the rejected claims, which include averaging received correlation symbols and then performing a (single) set of correlations.

Accordingly, on the ground that Jokinen nowhere discloses averaging correlation symbols to determine a calculated correlation sequence and then performing a plurality of correlations using the calculated correlation sequence, but instead discloses averaging correlations using different correlation sequences, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New claims

New claims 9-16 recite limitations corresponding to those of claim 1 relied on for patentability over Jokinen (i.e. calculating a correlation sequence based on averaging symbols of a received training sequence), and are therefore believed patentable over Jokinen for the same reasons as given above for claim 1.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the

claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Respectfully submitted,

24 Oct. 2006
Date

James A. Retter
Registration No. 41,266

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955